

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed May 28, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to September 28, 2010. Also, filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Continued Examination*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 25, 2006; April 18, 2007; June 23, 2009; and October 15, 2009.

Claims 23-43 are pending in the present application, of which claims 23 and 43 are independent. Claims 23-28, 30-32, 34, 35, 39, 42 and 43 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action objects to the abstract and specifically requests avoidance of the use of the term "means." In response, the abstract has been amended to avoid use of the term "means." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are in order and respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 23-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, "as failing to comply with the written description requirement" and specifically asserting that "[t]he limitations 'first decision unit', 'second decision unit'; 'third decision unit'; 'fourth decision unit' 'fifth decision unit', 'sixth decision unit', 'input decision unit', 'seventh decision unit', 'eighth decision unit', 'search decision unit', 'an input decision unit' are not supported by the specification" (pages 2-3, Paper No. 20100525). In response, the claims have been amended to remove the above-referenced terms.

The Official Action rejects claims 23-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, "as being indefinite" and specifically asserting that "[i]n claim 23, the phrase 'to that an affirmative decision' is unclear," that "[i]n claim 24, it is unclear which unit (at

line 2) is being referred to for acquiring a current position” and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the tracing input” in claim 31. In response, the claims have been amended to either remove the above-referenced terms or have been amended for clarity.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims are adequately described and supported in the specification, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and are definite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(a), 1.20(b), 1.20(c), and 1.20(d) (except the Issue Fee) which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2280.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
3975 Fair Ridge Drive
Suite 20 North
Fairfax, Virginia 22033
(571) 434-6789